

FEB 28 2007

Applicant: Chimitt et al.
Application No.: 10/706,345

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-25 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0158836 to Venkatesh et al. (hereinafter "Venkatesh"). Claims 3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatesh in view of well known art.

By the foregoing amendments, Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 14 to more distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention.

Venkatesh relates to a method and apparatus for managing access to a file system. A client makes a request to access a file (paragraph 0061). The request is passed to a meta file system manager (paragraph 0062). The meta file system manager searches for the object that owns the file, and forwards the access request to the file's owner (paragraph 0063).

Venkatesh does not teach the inventions recited in claims 1, 9 and 14 of the present application. In particular, Venkatesh lacks the redirecting the initial IRP from the first volume filter associated with the meta-data extent to a second volume filter associated with the at least one data extent associated with the meta-data extent. The section of Venkatesh cited by the Examiner (paragraph 0066) does not disclose the redirecting step. That section of Venkatesh discusses Figure 11, which is a flowchart of a method implemented by the system shown in Figure 8. The same invention is described two different ways, and there is only one directing step performed by Venkatesh. In addition, all operations are performed within a single meta data file system manager. The meta data file system manager performs all of the operations associated with processing an IRP, retrieving the data and returning the response to the requestor. Nowhere

Applicant: Chimitt et al.
Application No.: 10/706,345

in the cited sections or elsewhere in the prior art is it taught or suggested the use of separate volume filters in which an IRP may be re-directed and transmitted. Therefore, claim 1 of the present application is distinguishable over Venkatesh.

Amended claims 9, 14 and 23 recite creating additional IRPs, and the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are also applicable to amended claims 9, 14 and 23. in that Venkatesh does not disclose creating additional IRPs using multiple volume filters. Therefore, claims 9, 14 and 23 of the present application are distinguishable over Venkatesh.

Because the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 9, 14, and 23) are distinguishable over the cited references, the dependent claims (i.e., claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11-13, 15, 16, 18-22, 24, and 25) are also distinguishable over the cited references without the need for additional discussion.


It is respectfully submitted that the amendments and remarks made herein place pending claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-25 in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this amendment as well as reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-25 are respectfully requested.

FEB 28 2007

Applicant: Chmitt et al.
Application No.: 10/706,345CONCLUSION

Based on all these considerations and amendment, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is again urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
David Chmitt et al.



Richard J. Gregson, Reg. No. 41,804
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: February 28, 2007

Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way, MS/E8-114
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19424-0001
(phone) 215.986.3325
(fax) 215.986.3090